

REMARKS

Claims 1, 2, 5-12, 15-21, 23-30, 33-40 and 42-48 are pending prior to entering this amendment. The examiner rejects claims 1, 2, 5-12, 15-21, 23-30, 33-40 and 42-47 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over Rossmann (US 6,405,037) in view of Evans, et al (US 6,650,889) and Brown, et al. (US 5,524,047). The examiner rejects claim 48 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over Rossmann in view of Evans, Brown, and Kato (US 6,775, 026). Applicants amend claims 1-2, 5-6, 8-12, 15-16, 19-21, 23-25, 28-30, 33-40, and 42-48, and cancel claims 7-8, 17-18, and 26-27. Claims 1-2, 5-6, 8-12, 15-16, 19-21, 23-25, 28-30, 33-40, and 42-48 remain after entering this amendment. Applicants add no new matter and request reconsideration.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103

The examiner rejects claims 1, 2, 5-12, 15-21, 23-30, 33-40 and 42-47 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over Rossmann, Evans, and Brown. The examiner rejects claim 48 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over Rossmann, Evans, Brown, and Kato. Applicants respectfully traverse the examiner's rejections.

Claim 1 recites *retrieving at least one of the printable documents from a content server located externally to the networking device responsive to the facsimile command received from the mobile device*. Claims 11, 29, 38, and 48 recite similar limitations.

According to the examiner, Rossmann's cellular telephone 100 discloses the recited mobile device. The examiner appears to allege that Rossmann's server computer 121 discloses the recited networking device. There is no disclosure in Rossmann, however, of the server computer 121 retrieving the recited printable documents from any device external to the server computer 121, much less from the recited content server. See, Rossmann, col. 15, lines 23-31 and lines 47-52; col. 24, lines 54-67, where the server computer 121 loads data from its own memory responsive to messages from the cellular telephone 100.

Furthermore, Rossmann teaches away from its server computer 121 accessing another server computer 131 or 141 responsive to messages from the cellular telephone 100. See, Rossmann, col. 15, lines 27-31, where the cellular phone 100 transmits messages directly to the server computer 121, 131, or 141 that is storing the information to be faxed. Since Rossmann not only fails to disclose its server computer 121 retrieving any information from an external

content server, but also teaches away from the recited claim limitations, Rossmann does not anticipate claims 1, 11, 29, 38, and 48, or their corresponding dependent claims.

Claim 49 recites *retrieving viewable data from a content server responsive to a request from a mobile device and formatting the viewable data into a form compatible for display on the mobile device*. Claims 2, 12, 30, and 39 recite similar limitations. Similar to the argument presented above, Rossmann fails to teach or suggest its server computer 121 retrieving any information from the recited content server, much less *formatting the recited viewable data into a form compatible for display on the mobile device*. Put differently, Rossmann does not teach or suggest formatting any data transmitted to cellular phone 100. Rossmann therefore does not anticipate claims 2, 12, 30, 39, and 49, or their corresponding dependent claims.

Claim 11 recites *a processor adapted to ... convert the printable content into a form compatible with facsimile transmission responsive to the facsimile command and transmit the converted printable content to a facsimile gateway, the facsimile gateway to route the converted printable content to the facsimile endpoint identified from the facsimile command*. Claim 29 recites similar limitations.

The examiner alleges that computer server 121 discloses the recited processor. The examiner argues in the instant Office Action, page 3, 11/27/2006, that although Rossmann's computer server 121 fails to convert the printable content as the claims require, the combination of the computer server 121 and Rossmann's fax gateway perform the recited conversion. Applicants respectfully disagree with the examiner's assertion, as the claims require the same processor to perform multiple tasks including the recited conversion. Since Rossmann discloses multiple devices (with different processors) performing tasks that the claims require of a single device, Rossmann does not anticipate claims 11 or 29, or their corresponding dependent claims.

To further crystallize this distinction, applicants have amended claims 11 and 29 to clarify that the processor transmits the converted printable content to a *facsimile gateway*, which clearly excludes the ability of the examiner to argue that Rossmann's fax gateway performs the recited conversion of the printable documents into a form compatible with facsimile transmission. Rossmann therefore does not anticipate claims 11 or 29, or their corresponding dependent claims.

Claim 21 recites *sending a facsimile instruction to the server system responsive to the displaying, the facsimile instruction to request the server ... transmit the converted printable*

document to a facsimile endpoint without providing a facsimile number associated with the facsimile endpoint in the facsimile instruction.


The examiner appears to allege that Rossmann's message discloses the recited facsimile instruction. Rossmann's message however includes a facsimile number that is associated with the Rossmann's facsimile machine. See, Figures 2A-2H; col. 15, lines 44-58. Since there is no disclosure in Rossmann of sending a message that requests the server computer 121 transmit the recited converted printable document to a facsimile endpoint *without providing a facsimile number* in the facsimile instruction, Rossmann does not anticipate claim 21 or its corresponding dependent claims.

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, reconsideration and allowance of all claims of the application as amended is requested. The Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned at (503) 222-3613 if it appears that an interview would be helpful in advancing the case.

Respectfully submitted,

MARGER JOHNSON & McCOLLOM, P.C.



Jeffrey J. Richmond
Reg. No. 57,564

MARGER JOHNSON & McCOLLOM, P.C.
210 SW Morrison Street, Suite 400
Portland, OR 97204
503-222-3613
Customer No. 20575